

CRB* TODAY

COURT REPORTERS
BOARD NEWSLETTER

GUARDING THE RECORD
FOR CONSUMER PROTECTION



Message from the Chair *Toni O'Neill*

ENSURING CONSUMER TRUST

It's Sunset Review time again for the Court Reporters Board (CRB), a time when the Legislature takes a closer look at the Board's accomplishments and completion of mandated tasks. A sure topic of interest, as always, is the low pass rate for the Certified Shorthand Reporter (CSR) exam. The matter is as complicated as the testing

process itself.

The CRB acknowledges the pass rate is an issue, but does not consider it to be a problem, as assuring competency is at the core of the testing process, not success rates. To guarantee that CSRs are qualified for the demands of reporting judicial proceedings, it is important to set the bar high, while also making sure that exams are relevant and administered fairly. To accomplish this, the Board works closely with the Office of Professional Examination Services (OPES) to conduct an occupational analysis every five to seven years. Based on the results of the analysis, an examination plan is developed to guarantee the exams reflect the knowledge and skills that are currently needed in the field.

Using the information gathered, four different types of exam development workshops are held, staffed by subject matter experts under the supervision of OPES. Exam questions are written by one group and reviewed and edited by another. A third group constructs an exam, choosing a variety of finished questions, and a fourth group sets the passing score. Each exam question is tied to the examination plan, ensuring that the exam meets the requirements identified in the occupational analysis and that no artificial or arbitrary standards are set.

The practical portion of the license exam mimics the real-life pressures associated with reporting. While candidates may be prepared for this

Message continued on page 2

COURT REPORTERS BOARD OF CALIFORNIA
2535 Capitol Oaks Dr., Suite 230
Sacramento, CA 95833

Toll Free: (877) 327-5272
Phone: (916) 263-3660
Fax: (916) 263-3664

www.CourtReportersBoard.ca.gov

Inside this issue...

Student Spotlight	2
Governor Vetoes SB 671	2
A Note from Jennifer's Desk	3
Updates to School Curriculum Regulations	3
CSRs Needed for Exam Workshops	4
Examination Statistics	4
Sunset Review	4
When Technology Bites Back	5
Frequently Asked Questions	6
Strategic Plan Successes:	
Two Years in Review	7
CSR Spotlight	8
New CRB Logo!	8
CRB Staffer Retires	9
TRF Pro Per Pilot Project Update	9
Citation Update	9
Updates to Fee Regulations	9
Citations & Fines Issued	10
Disciplinary Actions	10
Disciplinary Actions Pending	10

Board Members

TONI O'NEILL, CSR, *Chair*
GREGORY FINCH, *Vice Chair*
REAGAN EVANS, CSR
LORI GUALCO
ELIZABETH LASENSKY

YVONNE K. FENNER, *Executive Ofcer* KATIE
PALMIERI, *Editor*
PAULA BRUNING, *Layout Designer*

Message continued from cover

portion of the exam, life stresses and variables can get in the way, inhibiting a top-notch performance at any given moment. Candidates who take the practical portion of the exam have been prepared to successfully report and transcribe proceedings accurately, but they must demonstrate an ability to do so under pressure, on a day that the Board chooses (not a day they choose), and to pass with a 97.5 percent level of accuracy.

Qualifying under such rigor brings legitimacy to the CSR designation, allowing an attorney or a judge to know that a reporter is knowledgeable and skillful enough to protect the record. It also assures the litigant that their appeal rights are protected, guaranteeing an accurate record of the proceedings.

Acknowledging that the license examination is challenging, the Board also recognizes the difficulty of a court reporter's job. It's much more than reporting the spoken word, including identification of the speakers, knowing the myriad of laws associated with the practice of court reporting, and using superior English skills to produce a verbatim transcript. It is guaranteeing an accurate record and thereby protecting everyone involved in litigation. The license examination, from occupational analysis through certification, is the cornerstone of the CSR's professional reputation and ultimately the catalyst for consumer trust.

STUDENT SPOTLIGHT



Working in a law firm since 2005 as a file clerk, Jennifer Cash had been exposed to depositions and the field of court reporting, but hadn't considered it as an employment option until a colleague recommended it to her in 2009. "I was intrigued with court reporting as a career alternative. I always thought it looked fast paced and interesting whenever depositions were occurring in the office, but I hadn't really considered it an option for me because I have a child and need to earn an income. After my colleague suggested I check it out, I spoke with my employer. They were great about it! They worked with my hours and are totally supportive of me going to school," said Jennifer.

In March of 2009, Jennifer enrolled in the court reporting program at Sierra Valley College in Fresno County. She feels the teachers are totally committed to the success of their students and appreciates the freedom to move through the program at her own pace. "My favorite class is speed. *I really find it fun and interesting to be challenged each day;* however, it can be frustrating at times when it takes a while to break through to the next level. Regardless though, I love that the opportunity to succeed is there every day," she said.

Jennifer hopes to graduate in summer of 2012 and go to work for a deposition firm. Her motivation for school and succeeding as a CSR is her daughter, who was only seven months old when she started with Sierra Valley College, and her fiancé, whom she will be marrying in May 2012. "I want to make my fiancé proud, and I want my daughter to have a comfortable upbringing, one in which I can provide a home and experiences that will help her to grow up whole and happy. Ultimately, I want to be a role model to her, letting her know that *I value education and the betterment of oneself* so that she will know that the expectations I have for her are ones I had for me," concluded Jennifer.

Governor Vetoes SB 671

Authored by Senator Curren Price, Senate Bill (SB) 671 called for implementation of mandatory continuing education for CSRs. On September 30, 2011, Governor Brown vetoed the bill, noting: "The whole idea of legally mandated 'continuing education' is suspect in my mind. Professionals already are motivated to hone their skills – or risk not getting business." This is the third time a bill for mandatory CSR continuing education has failed to achieve a Governor's signature.

A Note from Jennifer's Desk

Grace Periods - The majority of court reporters are very efficient at getting their license renewal payments in early. This helps avoid last-minute frantic calls from court reporters, the courts, and CSR agencies attempting to verify receipt of payment for a renewal. In addition to the stress caused by last-minute transactions, the overnight mailing of payments to make a deadline can be expensive.

While there is a grace period of 30 days for the license renewal fee, it is important to remember that it *only* applies to CSRs that are *not* working, as is stated in red on the renewal form that has to be signed each year. If you do not renew by the expiration date, you are not authorized to work as a CSR in California. So, keep it simple...

- Renew your license early to avoid up to \$2,500 in fines;
- Double-check to be sure the renewal form is filled out completely and that you have signed it *before* submitting it for processing; and
- Keep the CRB informed of your current mailing address, helping to ensure that you get future renewal notices in a timely manner.

Jennifer Hauptert is the Board receptionist. She is the first point of contact for most licensees and consumers, and processes all incoming mail, including renewal applications.

Updates to School Curriculum Regulations

On September 30, 2011, recently proposed updates to the regulations governing court reporting school curriculum (Title 16, Division 24, Article 2, section 2411 and 2414) took effect. The updates are the outcome of a Curriculum Task Force that originally convened in September of 2009 to conduct a comprehensive review of school curriculum regulations, a key component of the Board's 2009-2011 Strategic Plan.

Changes range from updating terms to more accurately reflect current terminology to altering the number of hours assigned to academic courses. However, the most substantial change was to call for qualifiers to be given under direct supervision, while no longer requiring them to be physically administered on campuses (section 2411(a)(2)). Such a shift in regulations paves the way for dedicated online court reporting schools to meet the regulatory requirements established by the Board.

"When we conduct our next round of reviews, I look forward to seeing how schools with online testing will verify student identity and authorship of work," noted CRB Executive Analyst Paula Bruning, who coordinates the school review process. "Protection of testing and qualifier material will also be important considerations for schools implementing online options," she said.

The Task Force submitted proposed changes to the Board for their consideration. The changes were approved in April, 2010. The Office of Administrative Law then reviewed the changes to ensure the rulemaking process satisfied the Administrative Procedure Act and approved the updates for inclusion in the rules.

CSRs Needed for Exam Workshops

If you currently work as a CSR and your license is in good standing, *we need you*. The CSR exam development process involves a series of workshops that requires active CSR participation. Without valuable subject matter expert input, the workshops cannot take place, and without a good supply of test questions in the test bank, the CRB will not be able to continue to offer the written exam three times per year.

For the health and growth of the industry, please consider accessing the CRB calendar at www.CourtReportersBoard.ca.gov to see if any of the upcoming exam workshop dates might work for you. Each two-day workshop is held from Friday to Saturday in Sacramento. All travel accommodations are arranged by CRB staff. All workshop participants will be provided with a per diem rate of \$150 per day and travel expenses. Those living farther than 50 miles will also be reimbursed for hotel accommodations at the State approved rate.

Please pass this important message on to reporters you know. The future success of the CSR industry lies with you. For more information on participating in an exam workshop, contact Kim Kale at Kim.Kale@dca.ca.gov.

Examination Statistics

Written Exams				
March 1, 2011 - June 30, 2011		Total	Pass	Overall %
English	Overall	99	45	45.5%
	First Timers	42	25	59.5%
Professional Practice	Overall	57	33	57.9%
	First Timers	36	28	77.8%
November 1, 2010 - February 28, 2011				
November 1, 2010 - February 28, 2011		Total	Pass	Overall %
English	Overall	67	15	22.4%
	First Timers	30	14	46.7%
Professional Practice	Overall	62	45	72.6%
	First Timers	37	33	89.2%

Dictation Exam			
June 2011	Total	Pass	Overall %
Overall	132	50	37.9%
First Timers	37	23	62.2%
March 2011	Total	Pass	Overall %
Overall	120	22	18.3%
First Timers	37	17	45.9%

Sunset Review

The CRB has been chosen to participate in the next cycle of sunset reviews, a process by which the Legislature, interested parties, and stakeholders evaluate boards and make advisory recommendations for consumer protection program improvements. By November 1, 2011, the CRB will conduct an internal evaluation and report on their findings to the Senate Committee on Business, Professions, and Economic Development, assessing specific areas of CRB activity, including data regarding licensing and enforcement. Once Senate Committee staff has investigated the report, a hearing will be held in which CRB representatives will respond to any outstanding Senate Committee questions. It is anticipated that the hearing will be set for spring, 2012. The Board was last reviewed in 2005.

When Technology Bites Back

Technology can be a wonderful tool when used as intended. It often simplifies court reporter efforts and allows tasks to be expedited which were once more time intensive. However, in some instances, it mimics essential core court reporting functions enough to allow the reporter to rely on it solely, which can have negative, unanticipated consequences.

Take, as an example, Backup Audio Media (BAM), the generic term of any audio recording, including the audio synchronization tool built into computer-aided translation (CAT) software. What began as a tool designed to help court reporters double-check difficult or awkward phrasing or vocabulary in order to ensure the highest level of accuracy for the final transcript has, unfortunately, become a crutch for the unwary user. It is so easy to get lazy while reporting, letting a mumbled word go while thinking, “I’ll pick it up off the audio,” or deciding to let a heated argument go uninterrupted because it’s being recorded. And then suddenly, the fight is gone. Why struggle to catch every single word? Why enter the fray and caution the overlapping speakers? Why not just pick it up later off the audio? And down this slippery slope is how the tool becomes a crutch.

What if someone requests, or even demands, the audio file? The legal question, really, is, “Can anyone subpoena personal property? Specifically, can anyone subpoena and cause to be turned over someone’s audio files? Here there is no “always” or “never” answer, no simple yes or no. This is a judgment for a court to make on a case by case basis.

According to information from the National Court Reporters Association (NCRA), what the reporter NEVER wants to do is be put into a position where he or she has made the decision to turn over or to refuse to turn over the material. They can then be held accountable for making the wrong decision if the court ultimately decides differently. In this sense, being presented with a subpoena protects the reporter. If the other party objects, they can move to quash the subpoena. The reporter just needs to sit on the sidelines and wait for an official ruling from the judge and then comply.

As a caveat, NCRA counsel added the following: If the recording exists, once the reporter is made aware that a demand has been made or is about to be made for the audio, he/she is obligated to preserve it, unless the audio is routinely destroyed after preparing the transcript (and there are no local rules that require the reporter to do otherwise) and that has already happened. In response to a subpoena, you can honestly and accurately report that the material no longer exists. HOWEVER, if it still exists when the reporter is made aware that a request to produce it is forthcoming, the reporter is under an obligation to preserve it. If the court ultimately decides that the audio doesn’t need to be turned over, fine. But if the court decides that it must be turned over, the reporter is in a position to do so and will have been protected against an accusation of tampering with evidence or interfering with an investigation. Additionally, unless the court rules otherwise, if an audio recording is ordered to be turned over, it is the obligation of the reporter to ensure that no confidential or off-the-record discussions are contained in the released recording. Again, unless the court orders otherwise, the court reporter should provide a copy of the audio, preserving the original.

So, while technology is essential, keep in mind that the most valuable tool at a CSR’s disposal is the skill set acquired through training, which, when employed fully, will always ensure integrity and fulfillment of legal obligations.

Frequently Asked Questions

Q I am currently covering a gang-related murder trial. Some of the testimony is being spoken in Spanish, with witnesses using sentences as well as single words. Am I required to record statements phonetically and research the spelling, or should I use a parenthetical (i.e., speaking in Spanish)?

A California Code of Civil Procedure (CCP) section 185(a) says, in pertinent part: “Every written proceeding in a court of justice in this state shall be in the English language, and judicial proceedings shall be conducted, preserved, and published in no other.”

This covers depositions as well as court proceedings, since a deposition is a judicial proceeding. In court it is incumbent upon the judge to require everyone to speak in English or provide interpreters so that the record may be captured in English. If a judge fails to follow through on this, the CSR should offer a gentle reminder. In a deposition, the court reporter should clearly inform all parties present that he or she will only be capturing testimony spoken in English.

In the event that Spanish is spoken intermittently, the following simple parentheticals may be used to produce the transcript for proceedings.

Q: Did you see the gun?

A: No. Carlos (speaks in Spanish). I told you.

Q: Did you speak to an investigator from my office?

A: (Speaks in Spanish)

It would be inappropriate for the court reporter, even if he or she spoke Spanish and understood what was said, to act as an interpreter and report the English equivalent or to report the Spanish phonetically and get someone else to translate it later. In the case of more exotic foreign languages, the court reporter may not know what language is being spoken. If this occurs, the following parenthetical may be used: (speaks in a foreign language).

Q Yesterday I prepared readback for the jury, crossing out sustained questions and answers as well as colloquy of overruled objections. A disagreement arose with one of the attorneys regarding sustained objections. The attorney's position was that sustained questions and answers should still be read back absent a motion to strike. The jury ended up reaching a verdict while the discussion took place, but I'm still curious as to what the correct protocol is in this instance.

A Reading back only questions and answers to which there was not a sustained objection is correct. Questions and answers which are the subject of a sustained objection, whether or not a motion to strike is granted, are never to be read back to a jury. When a judge sustains an objection, he or she is ruling that the question or answer is legally improper and may not be considered by the jury. Therefore, jurors are not entitled to hear it again during readback.

Q Is the handling and delivery of a judgment debtor's examination the same as any other deposition? If there is no stipulation, does it go by Code?

A A judgment debtor's examination is treated like any other court proceeding, even though they are often conducted outside the courtroom. While they usually start out in open court, where the case is called, the judgment debtor is typically placed under oath by the clerk, and then the judge sends the group to a nearby room to conduct the examination. A court reporter is not always present, but may be. If the examination goes smoothly, the parties most often leave without checking back in with the judge. However, if the judgment debtor refuses to answer questions or didn't bring the document requested, they will return to open court for the judge's intervention. Again, any transcript produced is treated like any other court transcript, with no right to read and correct, and no sealing of the original.

FAQs continued from page 6

Q What code states that both attorneys have the right to have the court reporter read back? I reported a deposition recently where counsel would not allow the opposing counsel to request readback.

A There is nothing in the code that addresses readback. Opposing counsel states the objection, and then the deposition proceeds subject to the objection per the code. CCP section 2025.460(b) reads: “Unless the objecting

party demands that the taking of the deposition be suspended to permit a motion for a protective order under sections 2025.420 and 2025.470, the deposition shall proceed subject to the objection.” So, although it would be civil and polite to allow readback, CCP 2025.470 is widely interpreted to mean that everyone involved must agree to go off record or the reporter must stay on the record. By extension, as long as one person keeps talking and refuses to go off the record, readback cannot take place.

Strategic Plan Successes: Two Years in Review

Implemented in 2009, the current CRB strategic plan was set in motion to identify key issues in the broader environment that affect the Board; to clarify its mission, vision, and values; and to identify future goals, objectives, and priorities. Since its inception, key components of the plan, which is set to expire this year, have been addressed, each with the theme of consumer protection at its core.

A top priority and accomplishment was the development of Best Practices for Use of BAM. A task force was established to explore the benefits and potential pitfalls of BAM, from which a best practices document was produced. Findings have been made available on the CRB website at http://www.courtreportersboard.ca.gov/formspubs/best_practice.pdf and serve as a resource for court reporters looking to learn more about responsibilities and the ethical use of this tool.

Another accomplishment was the completion of an occupational analysis, conducted in cooperation with OPES, to identify critical CSR job functions. Findings were used to develop the current examination plan, ensuring entry-level skills and knowledge necessary for CSR competence are met. A continuing series of examination development workshops are also being held to diversify test questions offered and assure that questions used for license exams relate to the examination plan.

Board staff also identified opportunities for improved operational efficiencies. Streamlining included consolidating the work of two half-time positions into one full-time position and changing the traditional Board meeting schedule to facilitate staff working at both the Board meeting and the practical exam, thereby reducing temporary workforce needs. Staff continues to look for ways to more efficiently accomplish mission-critical tasks with fewer resources.

While key elements of the strategic plan have been met, some remain unaddressed due to budget cuts and redirected priorities. Committed to excellence, a new strategic planning meeting is scheduled for October 27, 2011, at which time unfinished business can be reassessed and new goals developed.

CSR SPOTLIGHT

In 1982 when Ina LeBlanc first found her way to a career in court reporting, she was working in the accounting department at the Oakland Tribune. A graduate of Cal State Hayward with a BS in criminal justice administration, Ina had always had a love of the legal field. “My favorite program as a child was Perry Mason. I always knew I wanted a career in criminal justice, but didn’t know exactly what I wanted to do. I liked the idea of being an investigator, lawyer, probation officer, or parole officer, but I knew the contentious, gritty, raw nature of those positions wasn’t for me. *I wanted to be close to the swirl, but not in the middle of it,*” Ina continued.

“The answer to my career dilemma came to me one day at a coffee shop by way of a random encounter with a woman I didn’t know and have never spoken to again. She asked what I did for a living, and I shared my story with her. She suggested I look into court reporting and indicated that her father was a judge in Marin County and had always said court reporters made good money. As a result of that conversation, *I found the perfect career for me.* A month later, I quit my job at the Oakland Tribune and enrolled as a full-time student at Oakland College of Court Reporting.”

Ina taught a couple of CSR theory and briefing courses while attending school. She enjoyed teaching and attending school, but feels it was the hardest thing she has ever done. “Learning to be a CSR is much harder than college because you are learning a skill.



You must learn how to do something you have never been exposed to before. You not only have to possess the required writing skills, but you must have some familiarity with a variety of subject matters. *Lives depend on you,*” she said.

She believes the value of CSRs is in providing quality transcripts in a timely manner and that maintaining a quality workforce is a core function of the CRB. “Having the Board ensures the professionalism of our field. I am proud to be a CSR because of the level of integrity to which we are held,” she said.

Today, Ina is the sole CSR for the California Legislature. Working for the Senate Rules Committee since December 2008, she reports all Senate confirmation hearings. Prior to her employment with the Legislature, she worked for 23 years as a freelance deposition reporter. While *she has enjoyed most aspects of court reporting,* her favorite has been learning about varied topics. “Being exposed to many issues during the course of taking depositions for 23 years taught me a little bit about a lot of things. It is great to be able to hold my own in conversations ranging from construction defects to cosmetic-surgeries-gone-wrong,” she said. Looking to the future, Ina anticipates continuing to work at the Capitol until she retires, but warns that when “[she] makes a plan, the Universe chuckles,” as her plans often unfold in very different ways than anticipated.

New CRB Logo!

The Court Reporters Board has a new logo. With assistance from the Office of Publication, Design, and Editing at the Department of Consumer Affairs, the Board recently launched its new branding image. The logo will be used on all correspondence and publications to help consumers and professionals quickly recognize official documents and outreach materials.



COURT REPORTERS BOARD
OF CALIFORNIA

CRB Staffer Retires

Julia Miranda-Bursell is retiring after nearly seven years with the CRB and more than 30 years of state service. During her time with the CRB, she coordinated the on-site school reviews, participated as a team member during the curriculum review process, and administered the Transcript Reimbursement Fund (TRF) program. Ever interested in social issues, she also found time to complete her master's degree in teaching English to speakers of other languages.

We wish her all the best enjoying running and traveling and in her new venture volunteering as a long-term care ombudsman for residents of assisted living and skilled nursing facilities. Her caring dedication, calm demeanor, and helpful attitude will certainly be an asset to all the lives she will touch.

TRF Pro Per Pilot Project Update

As reported in the spring 2011 edition of CRB Today, the 24-month TRF Pro Per Pilot Project kicked off on January 1, 2011, allowing indigent pro per litigants access to TRF funds for the first time. The pilot project is limited to \$30,000 per calendar year, with a maximum of \$1,500 per case.

After processing applications received between January 1, 2011 - July 15, 2011, funds for the current calendar year had been allocated. At this time, completed applications without deficiencies are being held until previously allocated funding becomes available, or until January 1, 2012, when an additional \$30,000 is due to be deposited into the fund, whichever comes first.

Updates to Fee Regulations

On November 9, 2011, recent proposed updates to the regulations governing court reporting fees (Title 16, Division 24, Article 2, section 2450 and 2451) take effect.

While many of the changes memorialize the license fee change to \$125 which took place in 2010, there is a substantial restructuring of the examination fees. There will be a fee of \$40 for filing an application for examination, which is good for a three-year cycle. Additionally there will be a charge of \$25 for each separate portion of the examination.

“The change will help realign exam fees with exam expenses,” explained Examination Analyst Kim Kale, who oversees examination and licensing for the CRB. “Also, it will enable us to more accurately track which candidates are eligible to take which portions of the exam during a given exam cycle,” she added.

Candidates not successful in passing a test will be charged \$25 per test re-taken.

Citation Update

As previously reported in the spring 2011 edition of CRB Today, the Court Reporters Board filed a complaint in Santa Clara County Superior Court asking for the court reporting firm U.S. Legal to be required to pay a fine issued for alleged violation of the regulation restricting gift giving. A trial date is still pending.

Court Reporters Board of California - Citations & Fines Issued May 2011 - August 2011

RESPONDENT NAME - CITY	LICENSE NO.	DATE ISSUED	VIOLATION	SATISFIED
Smith, Sonia - Rancho Cucamonga, CA	11512	08/31/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8025 (d): Unprofessional conduct... availability, delivery, execution and certification of transcripts.... (failed to produce transcript)	No
Morita, Luanne - Tustin, CA	11274	08/31/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8016: Engaging in the practice of shorthand reporting without a certificate of licensure in full force and effect. (late renewal)	No
Roux, Jennifer - Fresno, CA	11033	07/15/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8025 (d): Unprofessional conduct; Section 8025 (e): Repeated unexcused failure...to transcribe notes of cases on appeal. (failed to timely produce transcripts)	No
Culy, Candyce - Fresno, CA	9065	07/07/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8025 (d): Unprofessional conduct; Section 8025 (e): Repeated unexcused failure...to transcribe notes of cases on appeal. (failed to timely produce transcripts)	No
Hudson-Hoehn, Christie - Upland, CA	7866	06/21/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8025 (d): Unprofessional conduct... availability, delivery, execution and certification of transcripts.... (failed to produce transcripts)	No
Carter, Sharon - Sacramento, CA	4889	06/16/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8016: Engaging in the practice of shorthand reporting without a certificate of licensure in full force and effect. (late renewal)	Yes
Martinez, Brenda - Menifee, CA	12858	06/16/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8025 (d): Unprofessional conduct... availability, delivery, execution and certification of transcripts.... (failed to timely produce transcript)	No
Cathey, Valerie - Redwood City, CA	9870	06/13/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8016: Engaging in the practice of shorthand reporting without a certificate of licensure in full force and effect. (late renewal)	Yes
Fischer, Rose - Capistrano Beach, CA	12119	06/10/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8016: Engaging in the practice of shorthand reporting without a certificate of licensure in full force and effect. (late renewal)	No
Schafer, Lisa - Woodland, CA	12723	06/10/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8025 (d): Unprofessional conduct... availability, delivery, execution and certification of transcripts.... (failed to produce transcript)	No
Reinhold, Sharon - Ventura, CA	7794	05/23/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8016: Engaging in the practice of shorthand reporting without a certificate of licensure in full force and effect. (late renewal)	Yes
Anderson, Jessica - San Diego, CA	12936	05/23/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8016: Engaging in the practice of shorthand reporting without a certificate of licensure in full force and effect. (late renewal)	Yes

The Citations and Fines remain posted for one year from the date initially issued. To find out whether a specific licensee has ever been issued a Citation and Fine prior to the date shown, or to obtain further information on a specific Citation and Fine, please contact the Board office toll-free at 1-877-3-ASK-CRB (1-877-327-5272).

The above respondents' Citation and Fines that reflect "Satisfied" have been satisfactorily resolved. Payment of a fine is not an admission to the violation.

Court Reporters Board of California - Disciplinary Actions May 2011 - August 2011

The disciplinary actions listed below cover the period of time from May 2011 to August 2011. To find out whether a licensee has had disciplinary action prior to May 2011, or to obtain further information on specific disciplinary action for a licensee listed below, please contact the Board office toll-free at 1-877-3-ASK-CRB (1-877-327-5272).

A disciplinary action is a formal proceeding that includes the basis for the action sought against the licensee. These disciplinary actions are held in front of an Administrative Law Judge and allow for attorney, testimony, and challenges as provided in the legal system. The Administrative Law Judge then issues a decision that the Board can accept, reject, or send back for additional information. Disciplinary cases can result in license suspension and/or a probationary status with conditions.

RESPONDENT NAME - CITY	LICENSE NO.	ACTION	EFFECTIVE DATE	CHARGES
Schnabel, Monica - Visalia, CA	13647	Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order: 3 years probation.	07/27/2011	Business & Professions Code Sections 480 (a)(1): Criminal conviction; (a)(2): Act involving dishonesty, fraud or deceit; (c): Making a false statement in the application for license.
Costa, Cheryl - Martinez, CA	10913	Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order: 3 years probation.	07/05/2011	Business and Professions Code Section 8025 (d): Incompetence in the practice of shorthand reporting.
Corona, Tanuya - Broomall, PA	12782	Default Decision and Order; license revocation.	06/13/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8025 (d): Unprofessional conduct; Section 8025 (e): Repeated unexcused failure... to transcribe notes; Section 8025 (h): Failure to pay Citation and Fine with an Order of Abatement.
Dayton, Andrew - Buena Park, CA	13353	Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order: 3 years probation.	05/02/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8025 (a) and 490: Conviction of a crime.

Court Reporters Board Of California - Disciplinary Actions Pending May 2011 - August 2011

Schantz, Leslie - Carpinteria, CA	13471	Accusation	07/18/2011	Business & Professions Code Sections 8025 (a) and 490: Conviction of a crime; Section 8025 (c) : misrepresentation in obtaining license renewal; Section 8025 (d): Unprofessional conduct, dishonesty.
Brewer, Stephan - Fresno, CA	13081	Accusation	05/06/2011	Business & Professions Code Section 8025 (a): Conviction of a crime; Sections 8025 (d), (f), (h) & (j): Unprofessional conduct, failure to deliver stenographic notes; Section 8025 (h): Failure to comply with Citation and Fine; Section (d): Unprofessional conduct, failure to time produce transcripts.